



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/763,727	01/23/2004	Minggao Yao	12553/127	7335
25693	7590	02/03/2006	EXAMINER	
KENYON & KENYON LLP RIVERPARK TOWERS, SUITE 600 333 W. SAN CARLOS ST. SAN JOSE, CA 95110			RENNER, CRAIG A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2652	

DATE MAILED: 02/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/763,727

Applicant(s)

YAO ET AL.

Examiner

Craig A. Renner

Art Unit

2652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 June 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/20/04 & 3/7/05.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings were received on 08 June 2005. These drawings are accepted.

Specification

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The following is suggested:

--PIEZOELECTRIC ACTUATOR WITH ELECTRICALLY ISOLATED CONDUCTIVE LAYER SANDWICHED BETWEEN ACTUATOR FINGER AND INSULATING LAYER--.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

4. Claims 10, 13-16 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Shiraishi et al. (JP 2002-074870).

With respect to claims 10 and 13-15, Shiraishi et al. (JP 2002-074870) teach an actuator component (52) comprising at least one layer of electrically-conductive material (includes lower-most 61, for instance); and at least one layer of electrically-insulative

material (includes 60 above lower-most 61, for instance), wherein the conductive material and the insulative material are to be applied to an actuator finger (52a) one layer upon another in an alternating manner (as shown in FIG. 6, for instance); and the layer of insulative material is wider than the layer of conductive material (as shown in FIGS. 5-6, for instance, i.e., the insulative material completely covers the conductive material) such that an insulative layer, applied to the actuator finger and sandwiching a conductive layer between the insulative layer and the actuator finger (as shown in FIGS. 5-6, for instance), at least partially encloses and electrically isolates the conductive layer latitudinal to the actuator finger (as shown in FIGS. 5-6, for instance) [as per claim 10]; wherein the insulative material is a piezoelectric ceramic material (paragraph [0055], for instance) [as per claim 13]; wherein the insulative material is lead zirconate titanate (paragraph [0055], for instance) [as per claim 14]; and wherein the actuator finger is a hard disk (10) drive micro-actuator finger (52a) [as per claim 15].

With respect to claims 16 and 19-21, Shiraishi et al. (JP 2002-074870) teach a piezoelectric actuator (52) comprising an actuator finger (52a) to receive application of at least one layer of electrically-conductive material (includes lower-most 61, for instance) and at least one layer of electrically-insulative material (includes 60 above lower-most 61, for instance), the application being one layer upon another in an alternating manner (as shown in FIG. 6, for instance), wherein the layer of insulative material is wider than the layer of conductive material (as shown in FIGS. 5-6, for instance, i.e., the insulative material completely covers the conductive material) such that an insulative layer, applied to the actuator finger and sandwiching a conductive

Art Unit: 2652

layer between the insulative layer and the actuator finger (as shown in FIGS. 5-6, for instance), at least partially encloses and electrically isolates the conductive layer latitudinal to the actuator finger (as shown in FIGS. 5-6, for instance) [as per claim 16]; wherein the insulative material is a piezoelectric ceramic material (paragraph [0055], for instance) [as per claim 19]; wherein the insulative material is lead zirconate titanate (paragraph [0055], for instance) [as per claim 20]; and wherein the actuator finger is a hard disk (10) drive micro-actuator finger (52a) [as per claim 21].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 11-12 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiraishi et al. (JP 2002-074870).

Shiraishi et al. (JP 2002-074870) teach the component/actuator as detailed in paragraph 4, supra. Shiraishi et al. (JP 2002-074870), however, remain silent as to the conductive material being a "metal," as per claims 11 and 17, selected from the group "consisting of Gold, Platinum, and Copper," as per claims 12 and 18.

Official notice is taken of the fact that metal selected from the group consisting of gold, platinum and copper is a notoriously old and well known conductive material in the

Art Unit: 2652

art in the same field of endeavor. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have had the conductive material of Shiraishi et al. (JP 2002-074870) be a metal selected from the group consisting of gold, platinum and copper. The rationale is as follows:

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have had the conductive material of Shiraishi et al. (JP 2002-074870) be a metal selected from the group consisting of gold, platinum and copper since such is a notoriously old and well known conductive material in the art in the same field of endeavor, and since selecting a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use is within the level of ordinary skill in the art, *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416 (CCPA 1960).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within


Art Unit: 2652

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Craig A. Renner whose telephone number is (571) 272-7580. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday 9:00 AM - 7:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, A. L. Wellington can be reached on (571) 272-4483. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Craig A. Renner
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2652

CAR